

FRANK M. FLANSBURG III, ESQ., Nevada Bar No. 6974
fflansburg@bhfs.com
 EMILY A. ELLIS, ESQ., Nevada Bar No. 11956
eellis@bhfs.com
 TROY P. DOMINA, ESQ., Nevada Bar No. 13862
tdomina@bhfs.com
 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
 Telephone: 702.382.2101
 Facsimile: 702.382.8135

Attorneys for Plaintiff Lausteveion Johnson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LAUSTEVEION JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES DZURENDA; FRANK DREESSEN;
 REGINA BARRETT; JOSEPH LEWIS;
 TIMOTHY KNATZ; DAVID WILLIS AND
 JO GENTRY,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:17-cv-01671-APG-EJY

**JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER
 TO PRELIMINARILY EXTEND
 DEADLINES AND REQUEST FOR
 STATUS CONFERENCE ON ORDER
 SHORTENING TIME**

(FIRST REQUEST)

Plaintiff, Lausteveion Johnson (“Plaintiff”), by and through his appointed counsel, Frank M. Flansburg, III, Esq., Emily A. Ellis, Esq., and Troy P. Domina, Esq., of the law firm Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP, and Defendants, James Dzurenda, Frank Dreesen, Regina Barrett, Joseph Lewis, Timothy Knatz, David Willis, and Jo Gentry (“Defendants”) by and through their counsel Aaron D. Ford, Esq., and Austin T. Barnum, Esq., hereby submit this Joint Stipulation and Order to Preliminarily Extend Deadlines and Request for Status Conference on Order Shortening Time. Pursuant to Local Rule IA 6-1 and Local Rule 7-1, the Parties request the deadline for motions in *limine* be extended from May 9, 2022 to **May 23, 2022**.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

On May 4, 2022, this Court entered an order (the “Order”) appointing Frank M. Flansburg, Emily A. Ellis, and Troy P. Domina as pro bono counsel for Plaintiff, Lausteveion Johnson (“Pro

24127289.1

Bono Counsel”).¹ Pro Bono Counsel entered their notices of appearance on May 5, 2022.² The Order stated the scope of Pro Bono Counsel’s representation was limited to “preparing a joint pretrial order and advising Plaintiff in the course of preparing for and conducting trial.”³

This matter is set for a jury trial on the stacked calendar on June 6, 2022, at 9:00am, and the corresponding calendar call is scheduled for May 31, 2022, at 9:00am.

Just before and just after the time Pro Bono Counsel was appointed, the Plaintiff, acting pro se, filed various motions to which Defendants must respond. These motions include:

- ECF No. 165 – Motion for jury to visit the prison;
- ECF No. 166 – Motion for a diverse jury;
- ECF No. 167 – Emergency Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum;
- ECF No. 180- Motion in *Limine*;
- ECF No. 181- Motion in *Limine*;
- ECF No. 182- Motion in *Limine*;
- ECF No. 183- Motion in *Limine*;
- ECF No. 184- Motion in *Limine*;
- ECF No. 185- Motion in *Limine*; and
- ECF No. 186- Motion in *Limine*

In addition, the deadline to file motions in *limine* expires May 9, 2022.

II. LEGAL DISCUSSION

A. EXTENDING TIME.

(1) In General. When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time:

(A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires; or

(B) on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect.

¹ See ECF No. 177, at 1, filed herein.

² See ECF No. 178, at 1, filed herein.

³ See ECF No. 177, at 1:13-15.

1 Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b)(1).⁴

2 The United States Supreme Court has recognized, “Rule 6(b) gives the court *extensive*
3 *flexibility* to modify the fixed time periods found throughout the rules, whether the enlargement is
4 sought before or after the actual termination of the allotted time.” *Lujan v. Nat’l Wildlife Fed.*, 497
5 U.S. 871, 906 n. 7 (1990) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted) (emphasis added); *see*
6 *also Perez-Denison v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan of the Nw.*, 868 F. Supp. 2d 1065, 1079 (D. Or.
7 2012) (citing and quoting *Lujan*, 497 U.S. at 906). Further, this rule, like all the Federal Rules of
8 Civil Procedure is to be liberally construed to effectuate the general purpose of seeing that cases
9 are tried on the merits. *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258 (9th Cir. 2010).
10 Regarding “good cause,” it is a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across
11 procedural and statutory contexts. *Id.* (citing several circuits *Venegas–Hernandez v. Sonolux*
12 *Records*, 370 F.3d 183, 187 (1st Cir.2004); *Thomas v. Brennan*, 961 F.2d 612, 619 (7th Cir.1992);
13 *Lolatchy v. Arthur Murray, Inc.*, 816 F.2d 951, 954 (4th Cir.1987)).

14 Consequently, requests for extensions of time made before the applicable deadline has
15 passed should “normally ... be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking
16 relief or prejudice to the adverse party.” *Ahanchian*, 624 F.3d at 1259 (quoting 4B Charles Alan
17 Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1165 (3d ed. 2004).

18 Pro Bono Counsel was appointed on May 4, 2022, and they entered their appearances on
19 May 5, 2022. Pro Bono Counsel needs adequate time to review the filings in this matter and
20 properly assess and analyze the needs of the case. Pro Bono Counsel also needs adequate time to
21 make contact with Plaintiff to discuss strategy. As such, the Parties submit that good cause exists
22 for the extension requested herein, which is not brought for delay or any other improper purpose.

23 Therefore, the Parties hereby stipulate and request the Court grant a short, two-week,
24 preliminary extension of the deadline for motions in *limine* and the deadlines to respond to the
25 following ECF numbered documents to provide Pro Bono Counsel the time to accomplish the tasks

26 _____
27 ⁴ LR IA 6-1(a): “A motion or stipulation to extend time must state the reasons for the
28 extension requested and must inform the court of all previous extensions of the subject deadline the
court granted.” Further, a “stipulation or motion seeking to extend the time to file an opposition or
reply to a motion, or to extend the time fixed for hearing a motion, must state in its opening
paragraph the filing date of the subject motion or the date of the subject hearing.” LR IA 6-1(c).

described above: ECF No. 165 – Motion for jury to visit the prison, ECF No. 166 – Motion for a diverse jury, ECF No. 167 – Emergency Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum, ECF No. 180- Motion in *Limine*, ECF No. 181- Motion in *Limine*, ECF No. 182- Motion in *Limine*, ECF No. 183- Motion in *Limine*, ECF No. 184- Motion in *Limine*, ECF No. 185- Motion in *Limine*, ECF No. 186- Motion in *Limine*.

B. REQUEST FOR STATUS CONFERENCE.

The order appointing Pro Bono Counsel states their representation is limited to “preparing a joint pretrial order and advising Plaintiff in the course of preparing for and conducting trial.”⁵ Trial is scheduled to commence on a trial stack beginning on June 6, 2022, and calendar call is scheduled for May 31, 2022.

The Parties seek clarification on the extent of Pro Bono Counsel’s representation regarding advising Plaintiff in the course of preparing for and conducting trial.⁶ More specifically, the Parties seek clarification whether the advisory role of Pro Bono Counsel includes preparing for and conducting opening and closing arguments, direct and cross examination of witnesses, and introducing exhibits into evidence at trial on Plaintiff’s behalf.⁷ Because of the compressed time frame before trial, the Parties seek a status conference on order shortening time to receive this clarification.⁸

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

⁵ See ECF No. 177, at 1:13-15; *see also* Decl. of T. Domina, at ¶ 5, May 9, 2022, attached as **Exhibit 1**.

⁶ See Ex. 1, at ¶ 8.

⁷ *Id.* at ¶ 9.

⁸ *Id.* at ¶¶ 10, 11.

24127289.1

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Parties request this Court grant a two-week extension of the deadline to file motions in *limine* (to May 23, 2022) and for Defendant to respond to the documents identified herein. The Parties also request a status conference to specify the parameters of Pro Bono Counsel's representation on an order shortening time.

DATED this 9 th day of May, 2022	DATED this 9 th day of May, 2022
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP	STATE OF NEVADA OFFICE OF
BY: <u>/s/ Emily A. Ellis</u>	ATTORNEY GENERAL
FRANK M. FLANSBURG III, ESQ.,	BY: <u>/s/ Austin T. Barnum</u>
EMILY A. ELLIS, ESQ.,	AARON D. FORD, Attorney General
TROY P. DOMINA, ESQ.,	AUSTIN T. BARNUM Deputy
<i>Attorneys for Plaintiff Lausteveion Johnson</i>	Attorney General
	<i>Attorneys for Defendants Regina</i>
	<i>Barrett, Frank Dreesen, James</i>
	<i>Dzurenda, Timothy Knatz, Joseph</i>
	<i>Lewis, and David Willis</i>

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATE: May 10, 2022